DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 944 CS 002 096

AUTHOR Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.; Manzo, Anthony V., Ed.
TITLE The Professor's Responsibilities and the Dissertation; Reflections on Advising Ph.D. Candidates; The Final Paper--How to Direct Dissertations with a Minimum of Trauma; and Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported during 1973: An Analysis.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 49p.
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v2 n2 Entire Issue Mar 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Degree Requirements; Doctoral Programs; *Doctoral Theses; Employment Opportunities; Graduate Study; *Reading Instruction; Reading Research; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

The "Epistle" is the Publication Forum of Professors of Reading Teacher Educators, which is a special-interest group of the International Reading Association. The topic considered in this issue is doctoral dissertations. Four professors, Billy Guice, Helen Robinson, Edwin Smith, and J. Jaap Tuinman, share their views on directing students through the dissertation stage of doctoral work. Robert Palmatier and Ellen Austin review and analyze the reading studies reported in "Dissertation Abstracts" during 1973. Regular features are Movers, which endeavors to record the job choices of new graduates and the relocation of others; Exchange, which offers a communication link between individuals who wish temporary locations; and Job Report, which lists positions available to doctoral-degree holders. (MKM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110944

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

epistle

vol. 2, no. 2

march 1975

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators

International Reading Association

CS 002 096

EPISTLE
VOL. 2, NO. 2

Coordinating Editor
Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia

Co-Editor
Anthony V. Manzo
University of Missouri - Kansas City

Advisory Editors
Lawrence Carrillo
San Francisco State University

H. Alan Robinson
Hofstra University

Editorial Assistant
Marilyn Lamarre
University of Georgia

Correspondence: EPISTLE
Robert A. Palmatier
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Professors of Reading
Teacher Educators

Additional copies of
EPISTLE are available
for $1.50 to members
and for $2.00 to
non-members.

Printer of EPISTLE is the
University of Georgia
Central Duplicating Service
Athens, Georgia 30602

Vol. 2, No. 2 March 1975

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators
A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

Contents

The Professor's Responsibilities and the Dissertation
Edwin H. Smith and Billy M. Guice

Reflections on Advising Ph.D. Candidates
Helen M. Robinson

The Final Paper--How to Direct Dissertations With a Minimum of Trauma
J. Jaap Tuinman

Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported During 1973: An Analysis
Robert A. Palmatier and Ellen Austin

Regular Features

EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities

JOB REPORT

EDITORIAL COMMENT

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

EPISTLE

March, 1975
Vol. 2, No. 2

Dear Colleagues:

Heading for the end of our second year calls for reviewing the history of the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators. The organization began with an informal desire for communication among professors primarily involved in training teacher trainers. An organization meeting at the 1973 conference in Denver resulted in a formal request for recognition as an IRA Special Interest Group. Since, IRA approval has been received and well over one hundred charter members have pledged their support. Annual programs have been presented at both the Denver and New Orleans IRA Conventions. A third meeting of the special interest group is scheduled for May 12, 1975 in New York City.

Communication has remained the focal point of the organization. This fourth issue of EPISTLE continues the effort at establishing a publication forum. Past issues have covered opinion-based status reports on doctoral training and graduates, research reports on doctoral programs, and evaluations of their training by recent doctoral graduates.

This issue continues by looking at the doctoral dissertation. Four veteran dissertation guides, Billy Guice, Helen Robinson, Edwin Smith, and Jaap Tuinman share their views on directing students through this stage of doctoral work. A review by Palmatier and Austin of reading studies reported in Dissertation Abstracts during 1973 concludes the article content of this issue.

Other services of the organization appear as regular features of EPISTLE. Movers endeavors to record the job choices of new graduates and the relocation of others. Exchange offers a communication link between individuals who wish temporary relocations. Job Report lists positions available to doctoral degree holders. Editorial Comment and Time Capsule view the reading business from a "now" viewpoint as it relates to the world and times.

The continuation of EPISTLE as a publication and communication forum is dependent upon your support. Articles provide the content and membership dues provide the wherewithall. Both are needed. Encourage peers and graduate students to join Professors of Reading Teacher Educators. We welcome all who are working in, preparing for,

or qualified to work as faculty members in graduate reading programs training educational and research specialists. Six dollars ($6.00) sent with the application blank printed in the center of this issue will add you to our mailing list of supporters.

See you in New York at our next annual meeting. The agenda will include information on legislation affecting reading, graduate program evaluation, dissertation topic trends, and job market variables.

Cordially,

Bob

Robert A. Palmatier
Chairman

Tony

Anthony V. Manzo
Co-Editor

The Professor's Responsibilities and the Dissertation

Edwin H. Smith
Billy M. Guice
Florida State University

This article resulted from a series of questions that Tony Manzo asked about the doctoral program in reading at Florida State University and especially about how we aided students in choosing topics, developing prospecti, and guiding and editing the writing.

Among the several duties of those professors guiding doctoral students are recruiting students, finding financial aid, diagnosing students' strengths and weaknesses, aiding the students in selecting their committees, selecting avenues to desired competencies, and guiding dissertations. The latter task is often the most difficult task, but it is also the most rewarding one. Recently the senior author, Ed Smith guided his fortieth doctoral student through her doctoral dissertation. Billy Guice served on thirty-four of those committees and has directed others for whom Ed Smith was a committee member. Dr. C. Glennon Rowell and Dr. George Aker have served on most of the committees. Thus an exceptionally cooperative working relationship which works to the advantage of both student and faculty has evolved. The dissertations directed have included historical studies such as The History of Spelling Instruction in America (Towery, 1970) and A History of Adult Literacy Education in the United States (Cook, 1971). They have included descriptive studies such as Similarities and Differences in Characteristics of Students Participating in Two Types of Adult Literacy Programs (Knowles, 1974) and The Relationship of Oral Reading, Spelling and Knowledge of Graphical Options (Cheek, 1972). They have also included experimental studies such as The Effectiveness of Linguistically-Based Decoding Program Used on a Card-Reading Machine with Disadvantaged Elementary Children (Burgess, 1973) and The Relationship of Learning Style, Self-Pacing, and Learning Decoding Skills Through Modules (Williams, 1973).

At Florida State University most doctoral students in the Reading/Language Arts Program have been recruited by professors holding doctoral directive. Others have been referred to the program by former students or have been attracted because of a professor or professors who have certain competencies of interest to the students. Such students generally select their major professor early in their programs. Then, with his guidance, they choose their other committee members. Problems of mutual interest to students and professors are the subject of continuous dialogue during the course work/competency period. The students are

encouraged to read prospecti of the dissertations of former students and then the dissertations that evolved from those prospecti. Usually, before they complete their courses in statistics and research design, they have narrowed down a number of problems to a manageable size, and often they are working on prospecti as they prepare for their doctoral preliminary examination.

Sometimes, after a brief search period, a student will express interest in one of the several mosaics that are usually on-going. For example, five dissertations have been completed on student knowledge of grapheme-phoneme correspondences and reading and spelling ability. These were carried out with primary grade students, intermediate grade students, junior high school students, and high school students. Four other dissertations have been completed on the critical reading/thinking growth of primary students, elementary students, junior high school students, and high school students. Such mosaics are originally conceptually controlled by the major professor, but they soon become conceptually changed as he and the committee grow along with the students.

Once a topic is chosen the student does a complete review of the literature, studies the designs of related studies, and discusses with each committee member the design of the proposed study. The student then writes up the design, and if need be, is assigned to a statistician at the computer center, and the student makes decisions with him and the committee concerning the most appropriate statistical procedures to use. Each member of the committee carefully reads and edits each chapter of the prospectus and aids the student in the tightening process. When the prospectus is sent to the Graduate Dean for approval, it is essentially the first three chapters of the dissertation. When the first draft of the dissertation is ready, each member of the committee reviews it carefully and makes suggestions, checks for grammatical problems, and carries out other editing tasks that accompany doctoral directive status. Each member is informed at all times of changes another may have suggested. Disagreements about suggested changes are rare. When the final copy comes from the bibliographer, the dissertation is read once more and, if informally approved, a date is set for the defense and the formality is carried out. At that point, only very minor changes have to be made, for all of the important questions that the committee members had have already been answered. No severe inquisitions are carried out, and both the committee and the student usually discuss how the study might have been improved and what else needs to be done in the area.

The writing of a dissertation should not be a mere academic exercise in which the student learns how to write a scholarly paper or demonstrates the ability to properly design and carry out a study. That should be demonstrated elsewhere in his program of

studies. A dissertation should result in an addition to knowledge in the area investigated; however, how it adds to the knowledge in terms of the methodology employed is not important. That is, historical studies, descriptive studies, case studies, and experimental studies are all acceptable. The mosaics that we feel have contributed the most to current knowledge are the linguistic and critical reading studies which are essentially descriptive studies. However, we have directed some important historical studies and some fine experimental studies.

Too often doctoral programs are developed, implemented, and modified with the concern of what is administrably easiest, what is most convenient for the graduate faculty, and what has been the traditional approach to graduate training. In such programs much is made of the doctoral student's responsibilities with little said about the professors' responsibilities. Such programs are time based with specified dates for diagnostic and preliminary or comprehensive examinations, have tool requirements such as one or two foreign languages that are little related to the students' research needs, and have rigid course requirements for all. They can often be identified by the necessity for students to make formal appointments when they need help, by faculty who complain of being overworked, and by harassed students. At the dissertation stage students in the Reading/Language Arts program at Florida State University find the doctoral directive faculty accepting the responsibility of being readily available for conferences, accepting the teaching responsibility that goes along with dissertation directive, aiding the students with the editing necessary with nearly all dissertations, and aiding the students in preparing their findings for publication. Our doctoral students are our finest product. Their dissertations reflect on us.

Reflections on Advising Ph.D. Candidates

Helen M. Robinson
Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago

Three years have passed since the last doctoral student, whose committee I chaired, completed his dissertation. My memory of all students is vivid because each one had special competencies, weaknesses, and interests; therefore, individual guidance was essential. My expectation was that each candidate produce the best dissertation of which he was capable because this research experience was the last step in preparing for the beginnings of his lifetime of research.

Emphasis is placed on preparation for research at the University of Chicago. Before a student entered the major program in reading research, he had passed a preliminary examination demonstrating some competency in educational psychology; history, philosophy and sociology of education; and statistical analysis. A special field of competency in curriculum and instruction or educational psychology was also passed.

Before choosing a dissertation topic, three courses covering the major research in the Sociology of Reading, Psychology of Reading, and the Teaching of Reading were taken, along with other courses or their equivalent, in clinical, elementary, and secondary reading instruction. In each of the research courses, emphasis was placed on the significance of the problem at the time it was done, the design, the procedures, and results. Then consideration was given to how subsequent developments in techniques could improve the research to make it more dependable. At the end of the discussion of a given group of investigations, unsolved problems were identified and new techniques for approaching these problems were examined. A final written examination in the field of reading assessed competency to begin a dissertation.

Students who had declared their major field in reading could choose their committee chairperson. When I had accepted an advisee, my first procedures resembled my own experience with Dr. William S. Gray and Dr. Guy Buswell. As I had more experience and the numbers of advisees increased, a doctoral seminar was organized where beginners could learn from those who were at more advanced stages in completing their dissertations. The excitement of the final defense of the dissertation, preceding the oral examination, was always thrilling to observe. At these meetings, the faculty in reading did not participate. Later, we often commented that the questions were of high caliber and often as probing as the orals given by the faculty.

The faculty in the field of reading presented their own research

at intervals too, from the beginning planning stages through to the end. One always encounters unexpected problems in research; the students were asked for suggested solutions and each was evaluated in terms of its strengths and weaknesses.

My personal contact with a candidate as his advisor began by asking the area in which he expected to do research. In each instance, the candidate narrowed his topic as far as he had been able to do without faculty guidance. No student was ever assigned a topic because each had studied existing research and unsolved problems and could enumerate myriad research needs. Moreover, it was my conviction that interest in a topic must be intense to carry the student through the baffling and laborious parts that characterize all research. Students who were not ready to identify a gross topic were advised to spend some time doing so. One student, determined to be assigned a topic, procrastinated a year.

Where the topic began to emerge and the breadth of it was recognized, together we considered other faculty members in Education, or related departments, who might be especially knowledgeable about other aspects of the topic.

The student was advised to develop a proposal, no matter how crude, and take it to the seminar for discussion. Afterward his revision was usually ready to take to the others he would like to have as committee members for their acceptance or rejection. Another revision, in light of specialized assistance, usually prepared the proposal for a faculty hearing. Following a very helpful interchange of ideas on the topic, another revision was made or the proposal was ready for full faculty approval.

Preparation of the research design and dissertation proposal was time-consuming, but it assured better research and avoided numerous complications later. Indeed, from 1965 to 1971, three of my doctoral students won the IRA outstanding dissertation award and eight were runners-up. In addition, several of the winners and runners-up have been advisees of my earlier Ph. D.students. Moreover, not one of my candidates ever failed the final oral examination in defense of the dissertation.

The major weakness in our program for the Ph.D., as well as that at many universities, appeared to be lack of opportunities to develop and teach college courses in reading. This problem was remedied by a seminar for that purpose in which one of our faculty members arranged for advance graduates to design and teach two sections of a course in secondary reading off campus for prospective teachers of art, music, science, and the like. Each graduate student taught a lesson, and the group met afterward to suggest improvements for the second session.

The Reading Research Center, with a multi-disciplinary advisory

committee, proved to be of enormous help, both to faculty and graduate students. The Center members included graduate assistants, associates, and post-doctoral associates. These students worked closely with faculty members; their duties ranged from helping to administer and score tests to serving as assistant coordinators of a study. As graduate students developed added competency, they were given more responsibility, and they had opportunities to serve, with pay, in different positions. Emphasis was always placed on enriching the experiences of the student rather than the convenience of the faculty member.

While a dissertation is of utmost importance in preparing a future researcher, other types of conceptual activities are important too. The term papers in the three research courses lent themselves well to different types and styles of conceptualization. Sometimes these papers led to the dissertation topic.

In some programs, dissertations are a part of the overall research of the major professor. Such a plan helps to accumulate information on a given topic or a special area. However, if the major professor has already built the framework, reviewed the literature in depth, and developed one or several research designs, the student is deprived of these experiences which will be essential to his future research. Perhaps some people in the field of reading do not carry on research because they are unable to plan and design it. Moreover, interests of doctoral students are diverse. Those who have studied with me ran the gamut from pre-school through college levels; from attitudes and involvement in reading to personal tempo related to reading rate, to most effective means of teaching specific skills or abilities. Finally, bright doctoral students challenge professors to broaden their own horizons and to keep abreast of the current gamut of research.

The doctoral committee, properly chosen, helps the candidate at crucial points and, at the same time, helps keep the major professor up to date on new developments. An example is statistical analysis, which has grown at a phenomenal rate since many of us studied the field. Another example is linguistics and psycholinguistics which offer new techniques in the study of language. The members of the committee should be available for individual consultation as the design of the research is being prepared. Moreover, they should meet, as a group, with the candidate to point out potential problems and to suggest alternative procedures. In all instances, they should be completely satisfied with the research proposal before the faculty hearing on it and willing to consider all suggestions arising during the hearing. During the period of data collection, problems encountered by the candidate should be considered by the entire committee. The final dissertation must be acceptable to all committee members.

At the University of Chicago, candidates for the Ph.D. were expected

to demonstrate their ability to write before they were admitted to the program. Yet most of them encounter problems of writing their dissertations clearly and concisely. Anyone who has lived so closely with a study knows it so well that he tends to omit parts that are essential for the one who reads it for the first time. Since the writing is as important in the total learning of research as any other step, it should be criticized by the major professor and other committee members. It was my policy to mark unclear sections, omissions, undue elaborations, and other problems as I saw them. At times, members of the dissertation committee differ regarding the best way to present the study, so it is essential that the candidate not be penalized by personal differences.

The dissertation should be completed before the final oral examination permits the candidate to elaborate on details not appropriate to the written product and to explain his reasons for choices that had to be made. Faculty members may gain insight into the depth and breadth of knowledge possessed by the candidate through face-to-face discussion.

Most dissertations appear to be experimental, probably because candidates need to be familiar with experimental research. However, creative candidates with deep-seated interests can reach out beyond the carefully planned experiment. For example, one of my candidates was consumed with an interest in how children became involved in reading. Although she spent several years developing techniques of study, she was able to shed some light on an area which had been avoided previously. Case studies are entirely acceptable as a dissertation, provided they are planned and executed in such a way that they illuminate a problem. Several of my doctoral students used introspective and retrospective verbalization of thoughts while reading to get leads on how pupils read to recall information, on how they filled cloze slots, and how they read for different purposes.

When doctoral candidates are properly prepared for undertaking research and when they are given enough guidance to avoid too much frustration, the learning experience should be greater than any other single course or program prior to it. Moreover, it should raise enough questions to trigger continued research by the candidate, after he receives his degree. For the major professor, the greatest satisfaction is knowing that each student has been motivated to produce the best study he can, in a reasonable amount of time. His greatest hope is that the young doctoral student will soon surpass his professor and carry on to future generations a passion for seeking knowledge.

The Final Paper-How to Direct Dissertations With a Minimum of Trauma

J. Jaap Tuinman
Indiana University

Dissertation time for many students is a period of high hopes and of repeated trauma. High hopes, often because the end is in sight, and sometimes, too, because the dissertation study is exciting, promising fascinating results. Trauma, because there are endless complications: broken promises, disappearing subjects, incomprehensibly obnoxious computers and elusive committee members.

For the dissertation director, too, dissertation time is a time of expectation and frustration. When a student has been around for a number of years, it's great to see him finish. When that student, in addition, has picked a good topic and is turned on by his/her dissertation research, I personally feel a strong sense of achievement. Nevertheless, many a time the frustrations seem to outweigh the positive experiences. What dissertation director does not have students who dislike the study they embarked upon, who can't write, who are mortally afraid of members, who "buy" data analyses and their interpretations, and who drag their feet?

How can the dissertation trauma be minimized? Below I have given some very personal answers to that question based on my experiences and on those of close colleagues. Maybe these experiences lack in generalizeability; perhaps all I am doing is describing the zany world of just a few idiosyncratic dissertation directors. So be it.

Stay off the wrong committees. Or, if you're the student, don't get a wrong committee. I now ask, whenever a student wants me on his/her committee, "Who else is on it?" I ask that for personal and professional reasons. Some students never finish because their committee members get into hassles which are, whether or not the people involved own up to it, for a large part, personality conflicts, or residuals of earlier feuding. But more importantly, I want to know whether I am the only "methodology" man on the committee. My experience is that, if this is the case, I usually wind up directing a large part of the dissertation, even if I am <u>not</u> the director. Or, if I am asked to be the director, I try to anticipate, by looking at the composition of the committee, how much help or interference I can expect on the basis of shared or conflicting professional beliefs. I <u>know</u> that on some topics I differ so radically with some colleagues that working together on a dissertation would be murder (with the student as a victim).

Don't direct a dissertation in which you're not interested. I know some institutions want you to direct dissertations. It's prestigious, it helps promotions, etc. Yet, directing a study that does not turn you on is a bad trip and eventually counterproductive.

I think that my career as a part-time dissertation director started as a graduate student, and I know that I am not alone in that respect. There are many students who simply do not get help in the methodological area of their dissertation, so they turn to fellow graduate students. They are usually happy to help-for a price, of course. Often, the consequences of such an arrangement are disastrous. I remember a phone call from one candidate the night before her final oral defense: "Jaap, on page 74 we say that the second order interaction was not significant. What do I mean by that again?"

The above incident is symptomatic. It points to the glaring fact that many dissertation writers come to the job with inadequate preparation. Is it their fault or ours? By and large ours, I believe. First, ability for and interest in research are hardly ever among the criteria used to admit people to our Doctoral Programs. Seldom is doing research a stated career goal of new candidates. Yet, very few students are allowed to graduate without doing some kind of empirical or even experimental study. For some, it is the only one in their entire life! Secondly, the typical Stat and Design course sequences are totally insufficient preparation for the day of reckoning: the writing of the final paper.

As a consequence, many students begin their dissertations knowing that they have inadequately mastered the methodology needed to execute the study. In many cases, I consider such students victims of the unresolved "Jekyll and Hyde" conflict typical of Schools of Education which have failed to define and integrate meaningfully their professional and their academic role. I used to advise these students to seek help from competent colleagues. Too often, however, the results are disastrous: wrong or too costly designs, too many unanticipated interferences with the study, nonsensical analyses. One student, I remember, brought me a correlation matrix where sets of data on different variables and different students had been correlated. The computer did not object! Recently, I have steered this kind of student in the direction of non-empirical dissertations. The trouble is to find suitable alternatives. And, if a student gets in a methodological mess, I usually wind up pulling him out of it, inch by inch, computer card by computer card.

From the comments above, it should be clear that I don't believe that a Doctorate in Education necessarily must be crowned

with an empirical dissertation. Requesting this, but not providing long-term research internships for every student, I believe, is living a lie. The lie becomes painful, however, for only those few members of the faculty who routinely must, in good conscience, provide ways and means for ill-prepared students to work their way through to the final page.

The real challenge for me is to get a student hooked to a problem he or she likes to research. For some, this merely means that I provide some literature. For others, it means long conversations about career goals. And then, for some, it means providing specific topics that turn me on or that flow from ongoing research. I know that the last alternative is rejected by many of my colleagues. I think they are kidding themselves. There are very few gifted students who conceptualize the whole thing on their own and, in addition, make a valuable contribution to the field. Why not, if one anticipates a weak dissertation, if the student is left to his own devices, narrow down the possibilities for inadequacies by having the student contribute to a larger research context? Within this scope, hopefully, enough room is left for conceptual activity on the student's part.

Directing dissertations is distinctly fun; more often than my comments above may reveal. Yet I feel we can do so much more in this area. Why are there so few long-term instructional studies? Is it because we require the student to wait till after his quals? Why are there so many weak experimental studies? Is it because Schools of Education have not yet defined what it means to be professional schools? Why do we turn out so many isolated dissertation studies? Is it because we confuse science with "doing a study?"

There are many fine dissertations produced in Schools of Education around the country but many mediocre or bad ones, too. Perhaps we should start to define the essential characteristics of "professional administrators," "professional curriculum specialists," "professional material developers" more precisely. Once we know what it takes to be one of these professionals we may acquire a much clearer idea of what it takes for a student to demonstrate that he or she has become such a professional educator. And the evidence may or may not include an empirical dissertation, or, perhaps no dissertation at all.

Doctoral Dissertation Abstracts Involving Reading and Reported During 1973: An Analysis

Robert A. Palmatier
Ellen Austin
University of Georgia

Doctoral dissertations annually provide one of the largest pools of reading research. In 1973 Dissertation Abstracts reported 273 studies dealing with reading. That much research deserves analytic attention. This report does not endeavor to evaluate or draw conclusions concerning the design, execution, nor results of these studies. Rather, the purpose of this article is to report on questions of interest to present and future dissertation researchers. The report presents data on dissertation sources, topics, populations, pages, statistical methods, and designs as communicated through researcher prepared abstracts.

Method

All 1973 volumes of Dissertation Abstracts were searched for studies which were identifiable by title or other means, as involving variables normally considered within the range of Reading Education. Thus, studies dealing with the teaching of reading, reading tests, relationships of other variables to reading, study skills, teacher training in reading, and adult literacy, for example, were included, while studies related to literature reading and interests were excluded.

A check list was prepared composed of items related to source, length, population, grouping, research types, testing, statistics, results, and research topics. The check list was completed for each of the 273 abstracts selected. These data were then analyzed, using a computer, with a Data-Text Compilation Program.

Results

The origin of dissertation research in reading is of special interest to professors and doctoral students in the field. The 273 dissertations reported were the products of ninety-one institutions. Of these fourteen schools each contributed six or more studies. The largest number of dissertations reported by any single institution was twelve. (See Table 1 for frequency data on the 14 highest producers.)

Table 1

Institutions For Whom Six or More Doctoral Dissertation Studies on Reading Were Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

School	Number
1. University of Georgia	12
2. University of Pittsburgh	10
3. Florida State University	9
4. Michigan State University	8
5. Ohio State University	8
6. University of Illinois at Urbana	7
7. University of Northern Colorado	7
8. University of Tennessee	7
9. Arizona State University at Tempe	6
10. Boston University	6
11. Hofstra University	6
12. Syracuse University	6
13. University of Maryland	6
14. Wayne State University	6

Since the major professor is a dominant variable in dissertation research, identification of professors advising the largest numbers of graduates is of interest. From a total of 131 major professors identified, eight professors guided three or more of the doctoral studies reported in 1973. As shown in Table 2, the largest number of dissertations in 1973 completed under the direction of a single major professor is five. This finding must be accepted with the knowledge that ninety-eight abstracts did not indicate the name of the professor supervising the doctoral study.

Table 2

Professors Reported During 1973 in Dissertation Abstracts as Directors of Three or More Doctoral Studies

Professor	School	Number
Smith, Edwin P.	Florida State University	5
Callaway, A. Byron	University of Georgia	4
Culliton, Thomas	Boston University	4
Artley, A. Sterl	University of Missouri	3
Aaron, Ira E.	University of Georgia	3
Burns, Paul	University of Tennessee	3
Curry, Robert	University of Oklahoma	3
Korey, Ruth	(Information not available)	3

At some point during the various stages of writing a dissertation an author often asks, "How long should a dissertation be?" If one is willing to accept as a precedent the performance of 1973 students, an empirical guide is now available. The mean dissertation length for 1973 entries was 157 pages, with a range from forty to five hundred eighteen pages.

The degree categories for which the abstracted dissertations were submitted were approximately equal, 144 (53%) Ph.D. and 129 (47%) Ed.D. Whatever the possible value difference, therefore, it

does not seem to increase significantly a choice in either direction.

The type of research acceptable for a doctoral dissertation in reading is apparently limited to three major types. Correlational studies were reported in 100 dissertations, descriptive procedures were utilized in 125 cases, and experimental methods were reported for 145 studies. In only three cases was a historical study reported. Table 3 shows frequency and percentage for the types of research reported in 1973.

Table 3

Types of Research Utilized in Dissertation Studies on Reading Reported During 1973 in Dissertation Abstracts

Type	Number	Percent
Correlation	100	36
Descriptive	125	45
Experimental	145	53
Historical	3	1

Reading includes a wide range of potential populations from which to draw subjects for research studies. Analysis of the dissertation abstracts for populations used indicated that primary and intermediate level students serve most often as subjects. The next most frequently utilized population groups (10 to 15% categories) in the studies reported were pre-schoolers, junior high students, four-year college students, and clinic clients. Given the present level of interest in secondary, junior college and adult reading, it is surprising to find that these three combined only comprise seven percent of the population choices reported. Use of teachers as a population in only five percent of the studies is also worthy of note, since teacher training is the primary present and future vocation of most doctoral advisors and doctoral graduates. Table 4 shows a detailed breakdown of the population data by categories. The fact that many studies reported using population groups representing more than one category accounts for the percentage totals in

Table 4 exceeding 100 percent.

Table 4

Population Groups Used in Doctoral Dissertation Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Population	Frequency	Percent
Primary (1-3)	8[illegible]	33
Intermediate (4-6)	75	29
Clinic Clients	39	[illegible]5
Other	39	15
Junior High (7-9)	33	13
Pre-school	25	1[illegible]
Four-year College	25	10
Teachers	1[illegible]	5
High School	14	5
Graduate Students	4	2
Non-College/Post High School	3	1
Junior College	2	1
Adult Basic Education	3	1

Appropriate research design and statistical treatment of data are major concerns to those developing dissertation research plans. The abstracts of studies published in 1973 indicate only limited attention was given to protective devices such as control groups (37%), random subject selection (18%), random treatment assignment (22%), and matched groups (7%). Even though a large percentage of the researchers reported no treatment and grouping controls, only four

percent categorized their work as case studies. Table 5 gives frequencies reported for each area. To accept the findings in this category it is necessary to accept also the assumption that non-inclusion in the abstract is indicative of non-inclusion in the study itself.

Table 5

Design Aspects Reported for Reading Research in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Aspect	Frequency	Percent
Control Groups	87	37
Random Subject Selection	43	18
Random Treatment Assignment	51	22
Matched Groups	17	7
Case Study	9	4
Other	7	3

Most research designs incorporate testing of subjects. Analysis of the dissertation abstracts for types of testing used indicated that nearly half (48%) of the studies used a pre- and post-test design. Over half (53%) of the researchers relied on standardized test instruments for data collection, while 15 percent constructed their own data collection devices. See Tables 6 and 7 for details on testing design and instrument types. The fact that neither table accounts for 100 percent of the studies is due to the fact that no information on these factors was given in the abstracts of several studies.

One aspect in the evaluation of dissertation designs is the sophistication of the statistics utilized in hypothesis testing. Analysis of variance and correlation are the two most frequently reported statistical methods. Frequencies for these and other methods are shown in Table 8. Many studies use more than one statistic in

Table 6

Testing Designs of Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Design	Frequency	Percent
Pre-test Only	69	28
Post-test Only	26	11
Pre- and Post-tests	120	48
Delayed Post-test	21	8
Design Specified	3	1

Table 7

Types of Testing Instruments Used in Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Type	Frequency	Percent
Standardized	133	53
Prior Research Validated	7	3
Researcher Constructed	38	15
Informal	18	7

in hypothesis testing causing utilization to total more than 100 percent.

Table 8

Test Statistics Used in Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Statistic	Frequency	Percent
Analysis of Variance	86	31
Analysis of Covariance	42	15
Multivariate	23	8
Simple T	41	15
Chi Square	17	6
Correlation	69	25
Other	31	11

Another frequent question of doctoral students is, "What if significant results are not obtained?" Graduation as usual evidently resulted for the fifty-one (19%) doctoral researchers in 1973 who reported only non-significant results. Only forty-five (17%) of the dissertation writers reported all significant results. A mixture of significant and non-significant results was indicated by 140 (53%) of the researchers.

The final factor investigated in this analysis was topics of study. Table 9 details frequency for each of thirty-one categories hypothesized by the principal author as being sufficiently inclusive to cover all potential dissertation topics. However, 178 (64%) of the studies included topics not included in the breakdown used.

In spite of the large number of topics classified in the general category of "other," certain clear indications concerning areas most studied were definable. Methodology comparisons were included in 105 (38%) of the studies. Other topics receiving attention in

more than ten percent of the studies included beginning reading (15%), word recognition (23%), disadvantaged learners (16%), developmental reading (12%), and reading comprehension (27%). Table 9 gives frequency and percent for the complete topical breakdown. Inspection of Table 9 demonstrates the inability of the topics selected to be defended as either exclusive or sufficiently inclusive categories. In many cases categories overlap, and studies dealt with more than one factor.

Table 9

Topics of Study for Reading Research Reported in Dissertation Abstracts During 1973

Topic	Frequency	Percent
Other	178	65
Methodology Comparison	105	38
Comprehension	76	27
Word Recognition	62	23
Disadvantaged Learners	43	16
Beginning Reading	42	15
Developmental	34	12
Linguistics	29	11
Readiness	24	9
Remedial	25	9
Attitudes	22	8
Theory Development	19	7
Test Validation	20	7
Cognitive Processes	17	6
Language Development	16	6
Content Area	16	6
Cross Cultural	18	6
Material Validation	16	6
Study Skills	15	5
Reading Rate	14	5
Individualized	12	4
Pre-service Teacher Training	11	4
Teacher Behavior	11	4
Readability	8	3
Corrective	9	3
Visual Perception	9	3
Auditory Perception	7	3
Adult Literacy	5	2
In-service Teacher Training	6	2
Critical Reading	4	1
Physical Relationships	2	1
Neurological Organization	2	1

MEMBERSHIP in the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association is open to IRA members working, qualified to work, or planning to work in programs for training individuals to work in graduate training programs in reading (in most cases, doctoral programs). Members gather annually for a pre-convention meeting at each IRA convention. Dues include a one-year subscription to EPISTLE, the organization's quarterly publication forum.

Renew or Begin Your Membership Now,
Share the Extra Blank with a Colleague.

Name_____

Address_____

_____

Institution_____

New Membership

Renewal

Note: As long as supplies last new members will receive a copy of EPISTLE Vol. 2, No. 1 upon payment of dues.

Present Status:

Doctoral Program Professor

Graduate Program Professor

Undergraduate Program Professor

Graduate Student

Public School Training Specialist

Other_____

send the completed application blank with $6.00 to:

Dr. Warren Wheelock
Secretary/Treasurer, PRTE
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri

Summary

Organization and analysis of data obtainable on reading dissertations as found in Dissertation Abstracts indicated doctoral research trends in several areas as reported in 1973. The 273 abstracts selected because of their relationship to reading education involved dissertations developed at 91 graduate institutions. Only eight of the 131 major professors indicated in the abstracts guided more than two of the dissertation studies reported in 1973. The type of doctoral degree earned by reading researchers is nearly equally divided between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D.

Characteristics which provide evidence of rather wide consensus include 1) primary and intermediate grade level students as most prevalent population, 2) healthy representation of correlation, descriptive, and experimental studies, 3) rather limited utilization of protective design aspects, 4) a clear preference for using standardized data collection instruments, 5) nearly half (48%) of the studies utilizing analysis of variance to secure a test statistic, and 6) results most often including a mixture of significant and non-significant findings. A mean length of 157 pages was also determined from averaging all studies for which page length was reported.

A final look at topics studied revealed few surprises. The most used topic was methodology comparisons with beginning reading, disadvantaged learners, developmental reading, and comprehension receiving sizeable attention. The fact that adult literacy, teacher training, and content area reading received so little attention indicates a lack of interrelationship between doctoral research and current prime concerns of reading educators.

Readers must take care not to overreact to the above findings. It must be noted that they are based initially on information gleaned from the dissertation abstract rather than upon analysis of the actual doctoral thesis. In addition, findings cover only those reported in Dissertation Abstracts during the 1973 calendar year. Any firm conclusions about trends must be withheld until analysis of output for other years is completed. The analysis instrument necessarily bears the design bias of the principal author and perhaps emphasizes information thought to be most important by him.

Even with the stated cautions, some messages are clear. An overall view of what doctoral students investigate and how they conduct their investigations gives a base for personal conclusions about individual doctoral studies and local dissertation expectancies in particular institutions. Hopefully, these findings will also serve as a charge to future doctoral researchers to consider initiating studies in the less frequently researched areas.

EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities

Need a change for a semester or quarter? Have a doctoral student who desires a work experience not available in your program? Curious about how your doctoral students compare with those from other universities? Or maybe you would like a trial period in a different climate area. Any of these desires are sufficient reason for contacting PRTE's Exchange Clearinghouse for faculty and graduate students.

The Clearinghouse functions as a collector and disseminator of information concerning persons who wish to exchange positions with their peers. In future issues information about individuals wishing to make temporary exchanges will be published. Contacts between those interested in exchanges will then be up to the individuals involved. Neither the EPISTLE, PRTE, nor the Clearinghouse at Arizona State can be responsible for making final agreements between parties wishing to undertake an exchange. We can tell you where the ballparks are but must leave arranging and playing the game up to you.

If you are interested in an exchange contact:

Dr. Ernest Dishner
Reading Center
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

A form for putting your name into the Clearinghouse pool is printed here for your convenience. Others are available from Dr. Dishner. When your form is received you will be sent an up-to-date listing of other "exchangers." Your information will, if you desire, also be printed in the next issue of the EPISTLE.

STUDENT AND FACULTY EXCHANGE FORM

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators - International Reading Association

NAME: _____, _____ _____
Last First Middle

POSITION: _____, _____
Title Institution

SPECIALIZATION: _____

	Office	Home-
ADDRESS:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
PHONE:	_____	_____

	Institution	Degree	Date
EDUCATION:	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

	Title	Location	Dates
PRIOR WORK:	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

	Type of Position You Wish	Duties Required of Your Replacement
EXCHANGE:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

WHEN: _____ _____ _____
Year Quarter or Semester Exchange Desired

OTHER COMMENTS: _____

_____

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

JOB REPORT

The following positions have been reported to the EPISTLE editors. Those interested in specific positions should communicate directly with the contact persons listed.

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of Arizona

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate

Responsibilities: Teach graduate and undergraduate courses in reading, including major practicum components; direct doctoral research; produce scholarly investigation and publications.

Starting Date: August, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Kenneth J. Smith
Head, Department of Reading
College of Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721

* * * * * *

Institution: Arizona State University

Position: Secondary Education Department

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Background experience in the area of secondary

Reading Education; teaching experience in the Secondary School (Grades 7-12) required; education and/or experience in the teaching of reading in the content area highly desirable.

Responsibilities: Teach both theoretical and practicum based undergraduate and graduate Secondary Reading courses.

Starting Date: August, 1975

Salary: Minimum Salary $12,000 for academic year with opportunities for Summer and Extension work.

Contact Person: Dr. John E. Bell
Chairman, Department of Secondary Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Additional Information: Candidates should send letters indicating interest and describing qualifications. Applications must include current resume and up-to-date placement papers, including a transcript of courses and three references dated after 1971.

* * * * * *

Institution: Bowling Green State University

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Associate or Full Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Depth experience in Developmental Reading; experience in teaching Graduate Reading courses; minor in Anthropology or Cognitive Psychology; extensive research and publication in recognized journals; ability to advise Specialist and Doctoral students in Reading; ability to establish a doctoral program in Reading.

Responsibilities: Provide leadership in graduate reading program; advise graduate students in Reading; serve as a consultant to public schools in the university service area; help initiate and organize a Ph.D. program in Education with specialization in Reading; conduct and report research in the areas of interest in Reading; perform other duties and responsibilities normally

associated with faculty appointment in a major university.

Starting Date: Fall 1975

Salary: From $17,500, depending on qualifications. Salaries are based on academic year and paid in 9 month installments. Probationary status. (Summer teaching appointments may be available at an additional proportionate rate.)

Contact Person: Dr. Verlin W. Lee
Chairman, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Telephone: (419) 372-0151, ext. 320

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of British Columbia

Position: Reading Education

Rank: Assistant or possibly Associate Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Successful experience in Secondary public school teaching; experience in organizing and teaching secondary developmental and/or remedial reading highly desirable.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate sections in secondary reading to prospective teachers from several subject areas; supervise student teachers at the secondary level; work with in-service courses, workshops, continuing education and local and provincial activity in secondary reading; provide leadership and coordination for development of undergraduate offerings in secondary reading within the Reading Department; develop summer offerings in secondary reading.

Starting Date: July 1, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. E. G. Summers

Faculty of Education
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1W5 CANADA

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of British Columbia

Position: Reading Education

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Experience in elementary school teaching and clinical training in the diagnosis and treatment of reading difficulties.

Responsibilities: Teach field based undergraduate courses in elementary reading methods, senior undergraduate courses in elementary reading (developmental); and supervise practice teaching.

Starting Date: July 1, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. H.M. Covell
Faculty of Education
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1W5 CANADA

* * * * * *

Institution: University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Strong background in various reading methodologies, as well as an interest in innovative teacher education programs; must be interested in the bilingual/bicultural component of reading programs, as well as producing specific reading strategies that will enhance professional growth in the area; elementary school experience required.

Responsibilities: Direct graduate courses in reading; work with in-service programs in area schools to develop interaction between theories of learning and in-class practices in Reading; teach general undergraduate seminars in the Teacher Education Program in Reading, function as an advisor and supervisor of student teaching for undergraduate students.

Starting Date: September, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. William J. Curtis
Associate Professor of Education
School of Education
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80907

Additional Information: In addition to the usual up-to-date vita information and credentials, please include three letters of recommendation and a statement of philosophy of teaching.

* * * * * *

Institution: East Texas State University

Position: Elementary Education-Reading

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Must have Doctorate in Elementary Education-Curriculum and Instruction-Reading; other studies should include Language Arts and Early Childhood Education.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate and graduate level courses in Reading; curriculum development and supervision of student teachers; particular consideration given to candidates having

academic and experience qualifications in Early Childhood Education.

Starting Date: September, 1975

Salary: Competitive for the geographic area including Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. Summer instruction is usually available at a third of base salary for a full load.

Contact Person: Department of Elementary Education
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
East Texas State University
Texarkana, Texas

Telephone: (214) 838-0507

* * * * * *

Institution: Harvard University

Position: Human Development and Reading

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate in Reading, Human Development, Educational Psychology, or a related field

Experience Desired: Proven competence in scholarship and research; interest in research on clinical and instructional aspects of reading, as well as on basic and theoretical issues; leadership potential in the field of reading, strong teaching ability, and an interest in participating in a clinical program.

Responsibilities: Teach graduate level courses in methods and materials, from pre-reading through advanced reading: diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities with supervision in the Harvard Reading Laboratory, and either children's literature or reading problems of adolescents and adults; advise doctoral students, including their research for qualifying papers and dissertations of CAS students (Certificate of Advanced Study) preparing for high level specialization; and Ed.M. students who are preparing to become reading and learning disability specialists; plan and carry out a program of research in the psychology and/or teaching of reading; collaborate with other faculty on organizing research in the Reading Laboratory.

Starting Date: Fall 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Professor Jeanne Chall
Chairperson, Search Committee
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Larsen Hall
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Additional Information: Please include a vita, a publication list, and three letters of reference.

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of Kansas

Position: Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Experience in public school teaching; ability to teach remedial reading courses for both elementary and secondary school teachers; course work or experience in college/adult reading.

Responsibilities: Teach graduate level courses in reading (remedial, college/adult on both Lawrence and Kansas City campuses; supervision of remedial reading practicum; advise master's, specialist, and doctoral level candidates in reading; develop and teach college/adult reading courses.

Starting Date: August 16, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Donald C. Richardson
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
117 Bailey Hall
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Telephone: (913) 864-4800

Institution: University of New Hampshire

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Clinical background; experience in primary or elementary reading.

Responsibilities: Teach clinical component (diagnosis, remediation, clinical practicum) of M.Ed. program for reading specialists; design new graduate program in reading.

Starting Date: September 1, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. John Carney
Education Department
Merrill Hall
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

* * * * * *

Institution: University of New Hampshire

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Experience in primary or elementary teaching; associated work in language arts.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate reading modules in a new five-year Teacher Education program; teach graduate courses in reading and language arts; design new graduate program in reading.

Starting Date: September 1, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. John Carney
Education Department
Merrill Hall
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

* * * * * *

Institution: Northern Illinois University

Position: Reading Clinic

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Experience in teaching at elementary/secondary levels and university levels; experience in working with graduate students; experience in directing doctoral dissertations; research and writing.

Responsibilities: Teach developmental/diagnostic reading at graduate level; direct and supervise clinical experiences of graduate students; research and writing.

Starting Date: August, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Jane L. Davidson
Director, Reading Clinic
Graham Hall 119
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Telephone: (815) 753-1171

* * * * * *

Institution: George Peabody College for Teachers

Position: Reading Education

Rank: Assistant or Associate Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: A record of successful professional experience including classroom teaching and clinical involvement of at least three years, the diagnosis and correction of reading disabilities, and demonstrated research competence; preference will be given to applicants who have worked effectively as a consultant and/or instructor of in-service education.

Responsibilities: Teach courses at the basic and/or advanced levels in the diagnosis and correction of reading disabilities, developmental reading, research in reading, and organization and coordination of practicum experiences in remedial reading; leadership expected in improvement of reading instruction in local schools through consultation and in-service experiences; on-campus activities in an interdisciplinary team to develop and evaluate teacher education programs, advisement of students and assistance in the Right-to-Read project.

Starting Date: Fall 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Lois Degler
Associate Professor of Education
Box 514
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Additional Information: Summer teaching optional, but usually available at 20% of nine-month salary for three summer courses. Benefits include TIAA-CREF retirement plans, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, Major Medical, and life insurance amounting to 16% of regular salary.

* * * * * *

Institution: Richmond College-CUNY

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Associate to Full Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Extensive teaching experience, record of achievement in research, program development, other scholarly activities.

Responsibilities: Teach in undergraduate and masters program for pre-service and in-service teachers; involvement with schools and community agencies, participation in reading centers; research commitment required.

Starting Date: Fall 1975

Salary: Negotiable to $33,000, plus liberal fringe benefits

Contact Person: Chairperson, Division of Professional Studies
Richmond College-CUNY
130 Stuyvesant Place
Staten Island, New York 10301

* * * * * *

Institution: Salisbury State College

Position: Director of Reading Center

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate or ABD

Experience Desired: Clinical and teaching experience.

Responsibilities: Direct the College Reading Skills Center and teach reading courses in the undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs.

Starting Date: August 15, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Michael J. Masucci
Chairman, Education Department
Salisbury State College
Salisbury, Maryland 21801

Telephone: (301) 546-3261, ext. 331 or 332

* * * * * *

Institution: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

Position: Elementary Reading Education

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Successful teaching experience at the elementary level; ability to work with university and public school personnel; preparation in the area of reading methodology: diagnosis and correction; ability to participate in program development; ability to direct students in independent projects and research related to reading; some experience in teaching reading methodology at the college level; ability to teach language arts and/or children's literature.

Responsibilities: Teach graduate and undergraduate courses in reading; participate as a team member in the Department of Elementary Education; participate in public school center-based programs for undergraduate and graduate students; provide leadership in the area of reading within college, community and state; serve on department, college, university and doctoral committees; and occasionally teach undergraduate language arts and children's literature courses.

Starting Date: August 16, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Donald Paige
Department of Elementary Education
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

* * * * * *

Institution: University of Southwestern Louisiana

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate

Starting Date: Summer or Fall 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. G. L. Coussan
Dean, College of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

* * * * * *

Institution: The University of Texas at San Antonio

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Experience in teaching at the level for which the candidate will be training teachers.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate courses; prepare graduate programs.

Starting Date: September 1, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Robert T. Alciatore
Director, Education Division
The University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas

* * * * * *

Institution: Texas A & M University

Position: Elementary Reading

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Specialization in curriculum and instruction and elementary school reading; minimum of three years experience in the elementary school classroom; college teaching experience and reading clinical laboratory experience desirable.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate reading and language arts method courses; assume a leadership role in developing an undergraduate reading specialization program; advise elementary education majors; contribute to the operation of an on-campus reading clinic.

Starting Date: September 1, 1975

Salary: $16,500-$18,000 for 12 months

Contact Person: Dr. Robert E. Shutes
Head, Department of Educational Curriculum & Instruction
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas 77843

Telephone: (713) 845-6811

* * * * * *

Institution: University of Washington

Position: Language Arts Education

Rank: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Experience Desired: Doctoral concentration in Language Arts Education with elementary emphasis and competence at the secondary level; experience on the elementary level required; some work in linguistics and in literature for children or adolescents is preferred.

Responsibilities: Teach undergraduate preservice courses in Elementary Language Arts Education; teach Language Arts Education courses for inservice teachers, teachers qualifying for certification, and graduate students; supervise the work of graduate students concerned with Language Arts Education at the elementary and secondary levels; conduct research in areas of interest in the field of Language Arts Education; serve as an advisor and consultant to schools and educational agencies concerned with Language Arts Education in the Northwest.

Starting Date: September, 1975

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. Dianne L. Monson
Chairperson, Search Committee
120 Miller Hall, DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Additional Information: Candidates should send a personal letter and vita. They must also arrange to have a transcript of graduate work and four letters of recommendation, written within the past year, forwarded. Candidates will not be reviewed until a completed application file is received. Deadline for applications is May 1, 1975.

* * * * * *

Institution: Millersville State College

Position: Reading Department

Rank: Open

Degree Required: Doctorate or comparable preparation with specialization in reading

Experience Desired: A record of successful professional experience for two years or more including classroom teaching and clinical involvement at elementary, secondary, and higher education levels of reading disabilities, as well as basic research competency; priority will be given to applicants who have worked effectively as consultants, directors and/or instructors of in-service education.

Responsibilities: Reading Center administration and supervision; teaching courses at the basic and/or advanced levels in: reading disabilities, the organization and coordination of a practicum in the diagnosis and correction of reading difficulties, research in reading and developmental reading; servicing reading needs of undergraduate and graduate students; assisting staff with reading related problems; participating as a member of an interdisciplinary team engaged in the development and evaluation of teacher-education programs; advisement of graduate and undergraduate students. Leadership expected in the development of improved reading programs in the public schools through consultation and in-service experiences, including assistance in the Right-to-Read Program.

Starting Date: January, 1976

Salary: Open

Contact Person: Dr. J. Richard Zerby
Professor of Education
Myers Hall, 215 C
Millersville State College
Millersville, Pennsylvania 17551

Additional Information: Summer teaching optional but usually available. Benefits include TIAA retirement plans, Pennsylvania State retirement, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, Major Medical, and fully paid life insurance.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

If you are reading this EPISTLE, thank you for being a return supporter. This issue marks the beginning of a new membership period. To keep EPISTLE alive and financially stable more friends like you are needed. Please share your copy with a colleague and invite him or her to join Professors of Reading Teacher Educators. Fills at least half a vita line.

EPISTLE still needs other forms of help. Drop us a line. We need to know what is happening in your part of the country so we can pass the word on. Legislation affecting reading, new school involvement in in-service education, modifications in teacher training courses, program developments affecting the current and future job market, doctoral program requirements, etc. and etc., all interest the editors and readers of EPISTLE. We have the pipeline for distribution, but more collection lines are a must. Add yours...

'Tis the season for relocation. MOVERS will return in the next issue. Notify us where your graduates have found jobs and, if you too hit the road, give us the info to let your friends know where to write you next year.

And we will look for you at our annual meeting in New York City. In case you have not checked the program, our session is scheduled for Tuesday, May 13 at 1:00 p,m. in the East Gallery at the Barbizon Plaza Hotel. See you there?

RAP

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE . . . (March, 1975)

Winter has now almost been...fortunately. With Spring we look forward to blossoms, sunshine, sunburn, and streakers. Who will capture this year's record...or invent the new Spring Fad? Speaking of records, rumor has it that ASU is considering a "we try harder" campaign after placing second in the EPISTLE program rating survey. No doubt others may work on changing their poll positions as well.

Summer School ahead...golden opportunity for retreading, retrending, and retraining teachers. Work at it extra hard this year...the news indicates school kids really need our help. But then the high incidence of violence and vandalism in schools may indicate that the kids have matters in hand.

IRA in NYC just ahead! Some activity suggestions: 1) helicopter in from LaGuardia to the Port Authority or Pan Am Buildings for a great view from above; 2) subway to Queens at 5 p.m. for a spectacular view of massed boredom; 3) walk from the theater back to your hotel and revel in the sense of security; 4) don't look for coffee and beignets at 2 a.m.; 5) discover the latest panacea(s) at the publisher exhibits; 6) share a teaching idea with a peer teacher educator; 7) run a comparative dialect study on Seventh Avenue; and 8) try a few meetings to see what the folks on the firing line, teachers, are doing about reading.

Wanted: a definition of a "reading person." What training and/or what credentials are required to qualify one for consideration when the job description says, "teach basic courses in reading education" or "develop training program in secondary reading?" The experience reported by one hiring institution (only 15 of the over 70 applicants when carefully scrutinized turned out to be "reading" people) gives priority status to such a question.

Historically, this issue of EPISTLE is related to a slowing in the inflation spiral and confusing contradictions on the economic future. One thing is sure, hard times have not stifled Americans' desire to keep ahead of the Jones...explain otherwise the advanced sales of the yet unseen junior Cadillac, the Seville. With only a $12,000 price tag seems like they can't make enough. But with Ford (the White House version) the cry is that not enough money is available to save Vietnam. Congress seems to have lost faith in the marketability of that commodity as the November of '76 looms on their horizon. But why shouldn't Congress be into management by objectives like everyone else is these days?

EPISTLE...over and out...March, 1975.

RAP

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ellen Austin (M.A., University of Georgia) is currently serving as a clinic supervisor while completing requirements for the Educational Specialist Degree in the University of Georgia Reading Department. She plans to work as a secondary reading classroom teacher next year.

Billy M. Guice (Ed.D., University of Southern Mississippi) is an Associate Professor of Reading and Language Arts at Florida State University. He has served as head of the Elementary Education Department at Florida State University. His publications cover a wide range of topics including oral language development; content area reading, diagnosis and correction; and linguistic approaches to decoding.

Robert A. Palmatier (Ph.D., Syracuse University), Associate Professor of Reading Education at the University of Georgia, is Coordinating Editor of the EPISTLE. He currently directs an adult literacy program funded by Right to Read and specializes in secondary and college reading instruction.

Helen M. Robinson (Ph.D., Univeristy of Chicago), Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago, held the William S. Gray Chair in Reading at the time of her retirement. Still active in publication efforts, she is co-author of the "Annual Summary of Investigations Relating to Reading:" co-author of Scott, Foresman's READING SYSTEMS and OPEN HIGHWAYS SERIES; a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the READING RESEARCH QUARTERLY; and is presently writing a report on a research study dealing with i.t.a.

Edwin H. Smith (Ed.D., University of Miami), as Professor of Education at Florida State University, specializes in adult education, psychology, and administration, particularly as they relate to reading. Among his numerous book, article, instructional material, and test publications is the SOUND READING PROGRAM, a linguistic-oriented programmed series for beginning reading. Educational Development Corporation publishes the SOUND READING PROGRAM.

J. Jaap Tuinman (Ph.D., University of Georgia) is now Associate Professor of Education at Indiana University. His interests in a wide range of research topics are reflected in his numerous publications and his present position as Editor of the JOURNAL OF READING BEHAVIOR. He is currently Vice President (elect) of the National Reading Conference.

next issue . . .

Lee Mountain and Catherine Cheader discuss the publication efforts of reading program graduates and offer suggestions for increasing early productivity.

Bob Palmatier and Ron Rood provide data on professors and institutions sponsoring dissertation research in reading, 1972 through 1974.

Warren Wheelock reviews the status of PRTE with a report of the Annual Meeting.

And? ? ?

regular features . . .

MOVERS

JOB REPORT